H-France Forum
Volume 19 (2024), Issue 1, #5

Jennifer Tamas, *Au* NON *des femmes: Libérer nos classiques du regard masculin*. Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 2023. 336 pp. Appendix. €23.00 (pb). ISBN 9782021514292; €16.99 (eb) ISBN 9782021514308.

Response Essay by Jennifer Tamas, Rutgers University, New Brunswick

I want to thank Hélène Bilis who took time to share insights and provide great feedback, along with James Steintrager who diligently edited this *H-France Forum* and chose reviewers whom I do not know personally. I also want to express my gratitude for the hard work of the four reviewers. I feel honored that *Au* NON *des femmes* fostered genuine interest from Hannah Frydman, a specialist in nineteenth-century French Studies whose expertise in history and feminism is deeply enlightening, especially for problematizing the cultural notion of *galanterie*. I am humbled that my book elicited so much enthusiasm from Malina Stefanovska, a scholar whose work on *mémorialistes* helped me prepare the Agrégation de Lettres modernes when I was working on the Cardinal de Retz. I am exhilarated that Véronique Lochert, who is known for her work on early modern theater's stage directions, *spectatrices*, and literary representations of rape, was convinced by the overall argument of the book, as well as its capacity to offer valuable teaching insights. Finally, I take very seriously the comments of Rebecca Wilkin, who is an expert on early modern women philosophers, including Gabrielle Suchon and Louise Dupin. She celebrates "the boldness of my gesture" and a "virtuosic versatility" that convey "vitality and hope," but she also expresses strong reservations regarding what she perceives as my inability to empower women through fictions, to "problematize manifestations of white supremacy," and to foster interest outside of France. However, the book has already been translated into Italian and it still arouses an international interest as I continue to receive invitations to speak about early modern French literature from universities in the U.S., India, Canada, Germany, and Belgium. Deciphering the reasons behind such a misunderstanding will be useful to ponder on the state of our field.

As it faces a decreasing interest and accusations of conservatism from both sides of the Atlantic, early modern French literature is central to *Au* NON *des femmes*. I attempt to counter these criticisms in three different ways: I bring the notion of consent as the blind spot of early modern French studies to the fore; I question the reception of male-centered readings that prevent us from retracing a dynamic dialogue between female and male authors; I track the transmission of female stereotypes that enabled rape culture and distorted our reception of the French literary canon.

Historicizing Consent through Fiction: The Power of Literary Representations

I understand that historians and philosophers ground their scholarship mostly on archives and real people, but as a specialist of literature I should not be reproached for relying on the close reading of fiction, except if the innuendo is that there is an implicit ranking between disciplines. Like Audre Lorde, I believe that "poetry is not a luxury" and I think that literature has a power to shape the way we perceive reality.[1] Rather than putting together a new *galerie de femmes*

fortes that excludes male authors, my book focuses on the distorted transmission of the French canon. Both Frydman and Lochert wished I had engaged more with nineteenth-century literature, which is something that other scholars have already done, even though I welcome extending my approach to other centuries.[2] Indeed, I fill a striking gap in early modern French literature: namely, I conceptualize consent in a society where being a woman made it structurally impossible to say "No." This is nothing less than a polemical position. On the one hand, Claude Habib claims that women can't say "No" before the introduction of birth control pills, while Catharine MacKinnon maintains that nowadays consent, from a legal point of view, is still a trap to make women fall under the domination of men.[3] To believe in the power of literature "to inject something new in feminist theory" (Frydman) is not about "rehabilitating the reputation of female characters," nor "a retreat" or "a regression" (Wilkin). Stereotypes, role models, and conceptions of heroism derive from fiction and have always been instrumentalized by philosophers, psychiatrists, and film and stage directors. For instance, Vanessa Springora, author of the recent, best-selling memoir *Le Consentement*, fears the power of literature and then uses it as a weapon to defeat the man who abused her. The detour through literature to depict the mechanisms of abuse in the books of Vanessa Springora and Camille Kouchner was so powerful that it led to the revision of French laws pertaining to sex crimes.[4] In the fields of history and philosophy, literature has long provided evidence and documentation to question cultural representations, including the notion of temporality itself. Fictional and historical figures can be compared once they become myths (Stefanovska), since changing our representations is necessary to change our cultural habits. Doesn't a battle of wits always come before the acquisition of rights?

Consent and Refusals: Ignoring the Elephant in the Room?

Au NON *des femmes* looks at how a patriarchal society that prevents women from saying "No" can be questioned and defeated by fictions, since these explore a linguistic gray zone and a historical tension. As early as the seventeenth century, Furetière's dictionary defines consent both explicitly (as the expression of an agreement) and implicitly (as tacit agreement). This tension still fuels Springora's memoir three centuries later. In early modern France, the Church advocated for the "consent of the spouses," while families arranged or even forced marriages upon their children to serve their own interests by exchanging their daughters and dowries like goods. The double meaning of *autel*, referring both to the table of worship and to a ritual killing, was a common pun used in theater, fairy tales, and novels to allude to the wedding as the day when women were sacrificed before entering a life of "long esclavage."[5] In the nineteenth century, the wedding night was often still perceived as a rape (Limbada); in the twentieth century, Beauvoir and Despentes still refer to marriage as a form of "enslavement."[6]

By retracing an archive of refusals, not from a philosophical viewpoint [7], but through a literary approach, my book tackles the question of sexual consent from the perspective of saying "No." Lochert and Stefanovska praise how I challenge the arbitrary division of genres and instead embrace a wide range of early modern French texts. By relying on close reading, I track the agency conveyed by the acts of refusal uttered by female characters who sometimes lack an authority to speak. I analyze how female refusals remain unheard both at the level of the fiction by their male counterpart and at the level of their reception by literary critics and scholars. Taking "No" for an answer should be possible if women are granted the right to talk. Fictions are porous to cultural movements. Therefore, *galanterie* and *préciosité* need to be seen as

polyphonic discourses that feed political interactions where women made it possible to be seen as real *interlocutrices*.

Who is Afraid of *Galanterie*?

Frydman is right to stress my nuanced position, which both Stefanovska and Lochert also endorse. I don't align with feminists who see *galanterie* as "the bedrock of rape culture today," but I don't conceive it as a "droit d'importuner" either.

By relying on a "lecture archéologique" (as Stefanovska puts it), I demystify female figures that the male gaze essentialized to feed into rape culture. These figures include the passive woman, the captive beauty, the consenting victim, the sex symbol, the frigid woman, and so forth. I show how these myths were used to nurture a script designed to make male domination acceptable if not desirable.[8] Even though a "perverted *galanterie*" has always existed [9], the co-construction of *galanterie* through preciosity does something else. Unlike treatises about civility, theater, and morality that prescribed silence to women, *galanterie* is a cultural movement that incites women to place themselves at the center of conversation (Lochert). Women can be heard, and they can also initiate conversations on love or tenderness without being perceived as indecent.

Therefore, I second Frydman who highlights the differences between the past and the present: *galanterie* cannot be "un féminisme" nowadays for the very reason that gender dynamics have evolved. However, the enduring instrumentalization of *galanterie* by men to manipulate or abuse women today is precisely what several authors of the past (including, I argue, Lafayette and Racine) denounced. If feminist critics of the present only rely on such a partial account of *galanterie*, this does not mean that we, as scholars, should accept an oversimplification that is another fixation of the male gaze applied to literary and cultural objects.

This fixation is perhaps why it is not "the fluidity of the seventeenth century that has come down to us, but rather an idea of seduction (in its modern sense) as a game between men and women with distinct roles for each" (Frydman). I tend to think that the idea of *galanterie* is more fluid than one might assume. Exquisite politeness, genteelness, and courtly manners may be found in exclusive male conversations, such as the ones that structure La Fontaine's *Psyché*. A sense of respect and a need to be pleasant characterize discourses that do not target sex as the ultimate goal for talking to one another. This is exactly why Rousseau – whose misogyny contrasted with several male thinkers of his time – attacks *galanterie* on the grounds that it effeminizes men. In fact, *galanterie* could very well open some space for gender fluidity. But instead of fostering new discussions, such a cultural phenomenon crystallizes a longstanding *querelle des dames* that has fueled a heated transatlantic conversation. *Galanterie* is more of a battlefield than a stable concept.

Establishing a Transatlantic Dialogue despite the Shadow of #MeTooUniversity

Because I have always been torn between different continents, cultures, religions, and educational systems, I managed to develop a sense of nuance that is not only essential to the very art of teaching, but vital to critical thinking at the university level. *Au* NON *des femmes* aims to foster a transatlantic dialogue in crossing critical traditions of both France and the U.S. By

continuing the tradition of importing gender studies to canonical texts of the Grand Siècle, I reexamine the transmission of early modern literature in the wake of #MeToo. The success of the book derives from this hybrid approach that spoke to Lochert, Stefanovska, as well as a range of scholars, writers and playwrights (Aurore Évain, Vanessa Springora and Alice Zeniter, among others). I believe that the book provides a stimulating interpretative framework that fosters a transatlantic dialogue as scholars from the 2024 American Society of Eighteenth-Century Studies Convention and other professional organizations already rely on its methodological approach to question both canonical and less known female works.[10]

Both Wilkin and Frydman regret that I didn't engage more with American feminists in early modern studies. I do to some extent, and I quote several authors Wilkin mentions when she "spells out names" to rally forces against what Roxane Gay could call a "bad feminist."[11] But haven't we been trained on both sides of the Atlantic to overcome our cultural differences? Should American scholars pay their tribute to the French Theory each time they publish a piece on feminism? And should we consider ourselves opponents because some have discovered gender studies through Joan DeJean and Domna Stanton, while others have turned to Myriam Maître and Linda Timmermans for help conceptualizing *préciosité* and the importance of women? By crossing gender studies with canonical texts, I seek to renew a dialogue between two cultural traditions. The lack of translations and the denigration of American feminist scholarship by some professors in France are mirrored by the same denigration from some American specialists towards scholarship produced in France by women and younger researchers. It is symptomatic that Wilkin's impressive number of references does not include a single mention of relevant French scholarship such as *Les Précieuses* or *L'Accès des femmes à la culture sous l'Ancien Régime*.[12] To my disappointment, it seems that *Au* NON *des femmes* has become the scapegoat for a systemic problem that goes beyond my book, especially because *cabales* and *coteries* are not the sole prerogatives of influential male professors. If all those who had suffered physical or psychological abuse, intimidation, ghosting and abject blackmail wrote #MeTooUniversity or #BalanceTesPontes, we would be surprised at the extent of the damage in a profession that prides itself on its lofty intellectual goals.

Questioning the Transmission of French Literature and Culture

Interestingly, when I do refer to feminist scholarship produced in English, these references are deemed inappropriate. Both Frydman and Wilkin claim that Laura Mulvey's elaboration of the male gaze is outdated. First, this concept has admittedly aged within the timeframe of academic research, but it still bears much hermeneutic potential. After all, feminists in early modern studies have not yet investigated how the concept of the male gaze challenges traditional narrative tools used in literary studies. Secondly, I do not align with an ideology that simplifies texts and pits evil, straight, white male authors against everyone else. When Wilkin qualifies Bérénice as "Titus's sad detritus," she does not help anyone to understand Racine's play. Similarly, her reminder of Cocteau's well-known sexual orientation has nothing to do with the objectification of Belle in the movie: sexual consent, female desire, and the freedom to say "No" are nowhere to be found and Villeneuve's message has been lost here. Thirdly, readers will decide whether *Au* NON *des femmes* "is a manifesto," but my book made these texts accessible to a broader audience. I strongly believe that we should engage in dialogue with people beyond the confines of any enlightened club. For too long, some scholars have been tempted to preach to the converted and to seek solace and comfort within their own chapel.

Reading these four reviews helped me think about my work differently. I used “we” and “our”, something Stefanovska and Lochert sympathize with, to welcome new and collaborative reinterpretations of influential texts while rediscovering other lesser-known works. I am honored that my book has been a bestseller because it made me realize that some radically different individuals, including my own American students, recognize themselves in the “we” I use. While some people turn to literature as a source of insight and well-being, I do understand Frydman and Wilkin’s uneasiness about what they perceive to be an illegitimate assumption of unanimity. The French system might seem foreign to scholars who have the privilege of incorporating their research into their teaching without any constraints regarding programs, “maquettes” and “concours,” unlike French scholars, who often start their career at the high school level. One may be tempted to dismiss a foreign institution like the *Éducation Nationale* by deriding it as the “supreme expression of patriarchy” (Wilkin). But performing this kind of empty gesture without suggesting any solution ignores how scholarship may concretely challenge the very meaning of the French educational mission [13], which is something this book *is* doing. Therefore, it is mistaken to assume that what is going on in France remains in France. Whether we like it or not, the canon, in its male-centered format, prevails in France’s former colonies. People in Haiti, Tunisia, Cameroon, Algeria and many other countries still learn French literature through programs inherited from the Third Republic. Some of them specialize in French literature and teach worldwide, including in the U.S. In a globalized world, it is our duty to question the canon and to explore its gendered and racialized transmission.

Revisiting the Canon through the Lens of Intersectionality

Au NON *des femmes* questions a void in speech act theory with regards to gender: female refusals are denied their performativity because women are assigned a “subaltern voice.” [14] At the end of the book, I suggest that Olympe de Gouges tied the fight for women’s rights to those of colonized people and I question how it challenged the notion of French universalism, something that Antoine Lilti examines in depth.[15] Without dismissing “la lutte des classes” (Stefanovska) and racial inequities, my book does not focus on this “convergence des luttes.” This is an important subject that deserves a whole new monograph. For now, I am very clear about my approach in this book: I am not adopting a queer gaze, a decolonizing gaze, an ecological gaze, or a disability studies gaze. I am not doing so because these approaches should be dismissed, but because I deemed it necessary to question male-centered readings that have locked into place the transmission of the French canon and spread stubborn myths of female passivity and submission.

Frydman warns us against the side effects of “presentism” that could “flatten the differences between the past and the present” and Stefanovska reminds us of the danger of deriving our scholarship from trendy topics that run the risk of becoming obsolete for the next generation. In this regard, I do sympathize more with Lochert and Wilkin’s attempts to diversify our approaches. As readers and scholars, major cultural events such as #MeToo and Black Lives Matter foster an awareness that forces us to read and teach differently: that does not mean that the history of domination that prevailed in the arts can be cancelled, but it means that we can perceive it more accurately. We can’t change the influence that male authors exerted in literary history, but we can reinterpret it by incorporating new authors and examining why they matter.

Therefore, I welcome Wilkin's invitation to carefully choose the works we teach. I also think that the lens of intersectionality can be very stimulating. However, reforming the canon by including a rich privileged woman who benefited from slavery—for such is the case with Dupin—might turn intersectionality into an empty gesture. The revolution will not be televised, and intersectionality won't be performative. I feel uneasy about being lectured on multiculturalism and white feminism by someone whose main badge of honor is "the feeling of participating in the (re)making of history" (Wilkin). These kinds of theatrics do not heal the past and do not give a voice to the unheard. But they do prevent us from exerting critical thinking. And, certainly, Wilkin's invocation of the names of brilliant living authors (Miano and Zakaria) will not magically make her own approach to Dupin intersectional. The early modern *matrimoine* she wishes to point us towards as an example may very well be at the intersection of privileges (white/noble/wealth derived from slavery/woman) but does not include any Black writers or any reflection on periodization. Similarly, she uses colonialism as a shortcut to explain *Beauty and the Beast* by relying on hints (parrots and primates) rather than historicizing concepts, using close-reading and structural analysis. Her instrumentalization of literature to serve an ideology and feed an anachronistic view of intersectionality flattens the complexity of the text: for instance, parrots and primates are to be found in the tapestry of the *Dame à la Licorne*, crafted before the time of French colonization. These animals belong to the tradition of bestiaries. Therefore, Villeneuve weaves fairy-tale elements and "exotic" materials in a deeply ambivalent way. In a similar fashion, the invisible labor force embodied by *génies invisibles et animaux* might point to the context of slavery, but not at the expense of the usual tropes of magic: there lies the complexity of literature that defies one-sided ideologies. In recent talks and in a forthcoming article, I have analyzed how this fairy tale challenges our understanding of *race*.[16] This is why I am concerned with Wilkin's establishing a new canon supposedly through the prism of intersectionality: while using the slave-owned fortune of Dupin to vaguely allude to colonialism, she also essentializes the concept of race without questioning its unstable definition and the history of violence behind the conjunction of skin color and race; unlike Noémie Ndiaye, she does not reflect on racial terminology.[17]

Which authors should we teach, then? Would Racine and Laclos have been worth a spot in this reformed canon if they had derived their fortune from triangular trade to foster conversations on colonialism? This argument does not make sense to me. Similarly, being a woman working on women does not earn you a magic ticket on the shelves of the *matrimoine*. Human beings, their literary productions and their cultural backgrounds are both complex and paradoxical. On the one hand, Dupin advocates for equal rights, but she does not question one of the main sources of her fortune: slavery. On the other hand, Rousseau, who served as her secretary and completed all of her research in this subordinate role, shares misogynist views but stands against slavery. I don't see why we should choose between male and female authors. Using Dupin to engage students to speak about slavery is as efficient as using Rousseau to encourage debates on feminism. And cancelling Racine and Laclos won't make classrooms more inclusive.

From an Inclusive Pedagogy to an Engagement with Public Humanities

I teach one of the most diverse student populations in the country (Rutgers University has over 50% non-white students) and I was awarded three teaching prizes in nine years. My research informs my teaching and *vice versa*. I really appreciate Wilkin, Lochert and Stefanovska praising the ways in which I transmit French culture within U.S. academia. As I reject ideological

discourses and advocate for an uneasy sense of complexity, I create a sense of community by historicizing, for instance, notions of consent, gender roles and power games that I believe remain the most important topics on American campuses today. This is precisely how the "we" that divided the reviewers of *Au* NON *des femmes* emerged. I don't advocate for a fake sense of community, but I really believe in the inclusive power of literature. As we depart from our differences and tacitly accept the variety of our socio-cultural backgrounds, the students and I commit to the analysis of texts through constant renegotiations. My role is to provide them with a new language because this is what literature is about: the lines and rhymes of Racine, the caustic style of Sévigné, the narrative virtuosity of Lafayette, and so forth. While I avoid indoctrination, I don't censure projections because they allow students to sympathize with the teaching materials. When a Haitian student identifies herself with Andromache whom she perceives to be a refugee and a war survivor, when an Indian student tells me that *La Princesse de Clèves* helped her understand why her parents already arranged her marriage or when students in general take pride in creating their own play from the models we studied, I genuinely feel a sense of community that makes me grow as a reader and teacher. Once students have established a connection with the texts, I can stress the differences between the past and the present and reveal the specifics of early modern France. At the end of the day, these literary texts become part of our collectively shared experiences. You don't need to be an American to be haunted by some pages by Toni Morrison and you don't need to be French to make pieces of French literature forever yours.

I sympathize with Wilkin's comments on declining enrollments in the humanities, especially in French studies, as I work with a high number of first-generation students. Having been one myself, I know that parents are more concerned with the potential benefits of a STEM degree rather than with the urgent necessity of Critical Race Theory. Teaching early modern French literature is hard but, somehow, I've managed to become "une ambassadrice passionnante et passionnée" (Stefanovska) whose methodology brings "une réponse intelligente" (Lochert) to hot topics. I have to turn down students each time I teach an honors seminar, and I am currently engaging with eighty-three enrolled students who are attending my early modern French literature course. So, when Wilkin is skeptical of "Whatever happens in French schools or doesn't happen in American universities as a result of [my] book,'' she does not suspect that it could be the other way around: it is my American students and the pedagogical approach I designed for them that made this book possible. This is the very reason why it targets both U.S. students and U.S. professors who are interested in passing on French culture.

Au NON *des femmes* shows how reception can orient or dramatically change the meaning of texts by means of appropriation, misinterpretation, or cancellation. This message was well conveyed to Frydman, Stefanovska and Lochert. As for Wilkin, I understand it is easier to disparage a book than to understand why it received such unusual and unexpected critical attention. I don't mean to brag about the success of the book, but simply to highlight that since the beginning my goal has been to advocate for public humanities, which is a core value at Rutgers University. Somehow, a book about early modern French literature has sparked remarkable interest from a variety of renowned American universities (Wellesley College, Princeton University, University of Pittsburgh, Bryn Mawr College, Hood College, Ohio State's Center of Excellence, Georgetown University, the University of Delaware, the University of Chicago, the University of Pennsylvania, Stanford University), prestigious institutions in India, Canada, Germany, Belgium, France including the École Normale Supérieure and the Collège de

France, major newspapers, journals, and magazines (*Times Literary Supplement*, *Le Monde, Le Magazine littéraire*, etc.), as well as TV and radio shows.[18] I see this success as being less about me than about the urgency of reframing the canon. I managed to bring together academia and a broader public from both sides of the Atlantic, precisely because the book is relevant for a wide variety of people (including learned societies of psychiatrists and gynecologists, organizations of women fighting AIDS and sexual violence). I am grateful for the country from which #MeToo emerged, the students and Rutgers University that made writing this book possible.

***

In *La Cité des Dames*, Christine de Pizan envisions a fortress that would protect women, no matter who they are, by shielding them, in particular, within the walls of Reason. Four centuries later, such a city has never been further from reality. Even the world-famous blockbuster movie *Barbie* has passed on to popular culture that: "Everyone hates women. Men hate women and women hate women. It's the one thing we can agree on."[19] However, writing this book gave me the opportunity to work through collaborations, correspondences, contradictions, and friendships that had nothing to do with allegiance and networking. Isn't this the real counterpower to the patriarchy: thinking together, rather than being under influence? Sharing ideas, discussing them, and agreeing to disagree? At least this is my goal and "Avec cette douceur, j'en accepte le blâme."[20]

NOTES

[1] Audre Lorde, "Poetry is not a luxury" in *Sister Outsider. Essays and Speeches*, Crossing Press, 1984, 36-39.

[2] Faith Beasley, Salons, History, and the Creation of Seventeenth-Century France: Mastering Memory (Women and Gender in the Early Modern World) (New York: Routledge: 2006); Camille Esmein-Sarrazin, *Lire, éditer, enseigner les romans du XVII^{e} siècle de 1700 à 1900* (Paris: Classiques Garnier, 2023).

[3] "Héroïnes de la littérature classique : celles qui ont dit NON'', Claude Habib and Jennifer Tamas, *Répliques*, Alain Finkielkraut, France Culture, March 18, 2023; Catharine A. MacKinnon, *Le Viol redéfini. Vers l'égalité, contre le consentement* (Paris: Flammarion, 2023).

[4] Vanessa Springora, *Le Consentement* (Paris, Grasset, 2020) and Camille Kouchner, *La Familia grande* (Paris, Seuil, 2021).

[5] Madeleine et Georges de Scudéry, "Histoire de Sapho," in *Artamène ou le Grand Cyrus* (1649-1653), (Paris : GF/Flammarion, 2005), p. 457.

[6] Aïcha Limbada, *La nuit de noces : Une histoire de l'intimité conjugale* (Paris: La Découverte, 2023); Simone de Beauvoir, *Le Deuxième sexe* (Paris : Gallimard, 1949); and, Virginie Despentes, *King Kong Théorie* (Paris : Grasset, 2006).

[7] Bonnie Honig, *A Feminist Theory of Refusal*, (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press, 2021).

[8] Manon Garcia, *On ne naît pas soumise, on le devient* (Castelnau-le-Lez: Climats, 2018).

[9] Alain Viala, *La Galanterie* (Paris: Seuil, 2019).

[10] "Le NON des femmes", American Society for Eighteenth Century-Studies, 54th annual meeting, Toronto, April 4, 2024. See also the forthcoming volume "Le consentement au crible de la littérature de l'ère #MeToo: enjeux et perspectives," co-edited by Aude Laferrière and Karine Germoni (to be published with éditions de l'université de Lorraine).

[11] Roxane Gay, *Bad feminist* (New York: Harper Perennial, 2014).

[12] Myriam Maître, *Les Précieuses. Naissance des femmes de lettres en France au XVII^e siècle* (Paris, Champion, 1999); and, Linda Timmermans, *L'Accès des femmes à la culture (1598-1715)* (Paris, Champion, 1993); on the subject of overcoming these transatlantic divides, see, *La Littérature, le XVII^e siècle et nous: dialogue transatlantique,* ed. Hélène Merlin-Kajman (Paris: Presses Sorbonne nouvelle, 2008).

[13] Paul Aron and Alain Viala, *L'Enseignement littéraire* (Paris, PUF, 2005).

[14] Gayatri Chakravorty Spivak, "Can the Subaltern Speak?" in *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, ed. Cary Nelson and Larry Grossberg (Urbana: University of Illinois Press, 1988).

[15] See *Au* NON *des femmes*, the épilogue, p. 307-318. For the notions of Enlightenment and universalism, see Antoine Lilti, *L'Héritage des Lumières. Ambivalences de la modernité*, collection "Hautes études" (Paris: Seuil, 2019); and, *Actualité des Lumières: Une histoire plurielle* (Paris: Fayard/Collège de France, 2023).

[16] See the forthcoming issue of *Dix-Huitième Siècle*, « Déboulonner les Lumières », ed. Flora Amann, Joël Castonguay-Bélanger, Anne-Claire Marpeau, and Stéphanie Roza.

[17] Thomas Chatterton Williams, *Self-Portrait in Black and White: Unlearning Race* (New York: W. W. Norton & Company, 2019); and, Tania de Montaigne, *Sensibilités* (Paris: Grasset, 2023); Noémie Ndiaye, *Scripts of Blackness: Early Modern Performance Culture and the Making of Race* (Philadelphia: University of Pennsylvania Press, 2022).

[18] For information about the book and its reception, please visit my website: https://www.jennifertamas.com/au-non-des-femmes

[19] Jennifer Tamas, "Dans 'Barbie', les stéréotypes sont finalement reconduits," *L'Obs*, August 30, 2023, https://www.nouvelobs.com/opinions/20230830.OBS77509/jennifer-tamas-dans-barbie-les-stereotypes-sont-finalement-reconduits.html.

[20] Pierre Corneille, *Médée* (1635), vol. 1 *Œuvres complètes*, collection “Bibliothèque de la Pléiade” (Paris: Gallimard, 1980).

Jennifer TAMAS
Rutgers University, New Brunswick
jt723@french.rutgers.edu

H-France Forum
Volume 19 (2024), Issue 1, #5